

# The Sun

SUNDAY, AUGUST 30, 1903.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid

DAILY, Per Month	80 00
DAILY, Per Year	9 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	11 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	90 00

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS—Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

Readers of The Sun leaving the city can have the daily and Sunday editions mailed to their addresses (which may be changed when necessary) for 70 cents a month. Order through your newsdealer or THE SUN, 170 Nassau Street.

Dr. Depew and His Turkish Policy.

We read with little surprise in the columns of a yellow contemporary the bloodthirsty advice which the junior Senator from New York is reported as giving to the President. Under the head, "Batter Down Old Beirut!" cries Senator DEPEW, that statesman is reported as urging the Administration to bombard Beirut—to "batter the walls about their ears." As he fiercely expresses it, or, at the very least, "if more temperate measures should be deemed advisable," to force the passage of the Dardanelles and menace Constantinople itself with American battleships.

Senator DEPEW's reasons for inciting the Administration to violent proceedings, even now when it is known that Vice-Consul MAGSESEN was murdered only in an error in the diplomatic cipher code, are thus reported:

"From my own knowledge of the Turkish character I say that unless prompt and forceful measures are taken by this Government to overcome the Turkish Governor and soldiers there, the attempted murder of our national representative will be but a beginning of the dreadful story."

He is then reported as explaining how his own knowledge of the Turkish character was acquired. It is a tale to freeze the marrow:

"In company with the late CONSUL VANDERBILT and his two sons, the present CONSUL and WILLIAM H. VANDERBILT, I started from Vienna for Constantinople. It seems that it became known throughout Turkey that the Vanderbilts and myself were making the journey, and extensive preparations were made to take advantage of us."

A powerful faction in the Balkan Mountains assembled at one of the most sequestered and desolate points along the railroad and proceeded to remove a section of rail from the track.

"Fortunately for us they miscalculated the train we were on, our own having passed before the rail was removed. But a wealthy Berlin broker and five companions were made prisoners."

What wonder the junior Senator from New York wants to batter down Beirut, or any other Turkish town which American guns can find a pretext for bombarding? The memory of the horrible incident in his own experience, and the thought of what might have happened if the powerful faction in the Balkans had torn up the rail at that sequestered and desolate point before instead of after his train had passed, are ever present in Mr. DEPEW's mind, and color his judgment as to the proper international procedure in the present case.

Senator DEPEW remembers, shudders, judges Turkish character by events that exist only in the past potential, and wants to bombard Beirut.

But is it quite fair to the people of a town where Americans have for half a century or so enjoyed privileges and immunities unusual in a Mohammedan country, to punish them so severely for something that did not happen in the Balkans, and for something that did not happen in Beirut, but which Mr. DEPEW thinks may happen unless their walls are battered about their ears?

The Commander-in-Chief at Oyster Bay, who needs no spur to energetic action in the Mediterranean or elsewhere, will do well to take counsel of the Hon. JOHN HAY, rather than of Senator DEPEW, in shaping a firm but decent policy with regard to Turkey.

## Canada's Railway Project.

The Canadian Parliament is engaged in a vigorous discussion of the Government project for a new transcontinental railway. The Liberal press, or perhaps we should say that portion of the Liberal press which stands by the Government in its proposed measure, presents full-page reports of the arguments presented by the Liberal members. The Conservative press is equally profuse in its presentation of the arguments of the Opposition.

We have already reviewed the plan of the Government for an all-rail route from ocean to ocean, partly Government owned and all Government aided, to cross the country well to the northward of present lines. As was indicated in that review, the argument of the Opposition is confined largely to protest against the construction of the eastern end of the line. Their position has now taken on a more definite shape, and while it is not yet precisely formulated, its general terms appear as follows:

1. The use of the present line, the Intercolonial, from Halifax to Montreal. This line is owned by the Government and has a ready-made Canada route \$70,000,000.

2. The acquisition of the Canada Atlantic line from Montreal to Detroit Harbor, on Georgian Bay. This would give an all-rail route from the Atlantic coast, and open a 380-mile "bridge" between the lakes and the port of Montreal.

3. The acquisition of that portion of the Canadian Pacific which runs between North Bay and Port Arthur, and the building of a rail connection from North Bay to Depot Harbor. This appears a doubtful measure, as it would probably involve an expropriation of that section of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

4. The construction of a double-track line from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, over which all competing lines would be given running rights. This would give a Government-controlled route from Winnipeg to Montreal or to Halifax, as shipping ports, except for the control of the lake transportation.

5. Government aid to the line from Winnipeg to Edmonton, on the eastern slope of the Rockies.

6. A Government road from Edmonton to the Pacific Coast, with running rights to all lines which have converged for passage through the mountains at that point, thus preventing the monopoly of one of the few easily available passes in the mountain range.

This seems a far more practical and pocketable scheme than that proposed by the Liberals. It makes provision for

that section of the line which is really needed and fully justified, the prairie strip from Winnipeg westward. That would open to settlement many thousands of acres of superior wheat land and furnish the same outlet for the product of that area as that which is now open to Manitoba and the country westward along the Canadian Pacific Railway. The double track to Port Arthur, on the shore of Lake Superior, will soon become a necessity in any case. That the Canada Atlantic line will be of great value within the coming years there can be no doubt.

Against this there stands the proposal of the Liberals to construct another line through the region already traversed by the unprofitable Intercolonial, and to continue that line from Quebec to Winnipeg, through a country which is as yet imperfectly explored, virtually an uninhabited wilderness whose producing possibilities are quite unknown. The time for the construction of that line may come, but its installation under present conditions seems to us, as it does to probably a considerable majority of the Canadians, premature, unwarranted and unwise.

The argument of some of the Liberals that present lines and those proposed by the Conservatives are open to ready attack and destruction by a force of Americans in case of war between the two countries savors of far-fetched bugaboo. As we are not going to war with Canada, we are not going to tear up her railroad tracks. Were such an utterly improbable occasion to arise, the location of a line 150 miles further to the north would be no guarantee of immunity from destruction by an American force. A few men with a few pounds of dynamite skillfully used on a few bridges can put any ordinary road out of business, and Canada has no military force which could guard against such a proceeding. But such a contingency is hardly worth discussion or consideration.

It is expected that the railway discussion will be closed within a few days, and the final vote will be watched for with keen interest. Should the Government lose its measure, the resignation of the Ministry seems little short of inevitable, and a general election may be precipitated.

## The Political Prospects of Ireland.

The friends of Ireland in the United States wisely refrained while the Land Purchase bill was passing through Parliament from discussing the political effects of that epoch-making measure. We observe, also, that even now, when the bill has become a law, Mr. JEREMY MCCARTHY, writing in the *Fortnightly Review*, avoids indicating in explicit terms the relation of Ireland's agrarian revolution to her demand for Home Rule. We purpose here to point out the grounds for believing that the Irish people are close to the fulfillment of their passionate desire for the virtual repeal of the Act of Union and the reestablishment of an autonomous legislature at Dublin. Our grounds for the belief are two: First, the Land Purchase act has rendered the Home Rule party incomparably stronger than it ever was before; and, secondly, its Unionist opponents have been irremediably disrupted by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S proposal of a preferential tariff.

There is no doubt that the Land Purchase act will eliminate the landlords for centuries have been regarded as the British garrison in Ireland, the sole reliable upholders of the Protestant religion and of British rule. Hereafter Ulster, as well as the three other provinces, will be entirely under the control of the peasant farmers and the priests. The former tenants will regard the transaction by which they are to be transformed into peasant proprietors as a British concession to Irish impotency. They will be perfectly right in attributing the assent of British taxpayers to a loan of \$500,000,000 and a gratuity of \$600,000,000, not to magnanimity or contrition, but to a wish to avert a revival of the incendiary proceedings of the Land League, and the necessity of resorting continually to coercion.

The concession, therefore, instead of being received with lasting gratitude, is likely presently to act as a stimulus to further impotency. Even if the peasant farmers were disposed to remain quiescent for a while, the Nationalist leaders could easily arouse them by pointing out how signally the path had been smoothed to an improvement of their political position by the disappearance of the landlords who had been vitally interested in keeping Ireland under British rule.

We need not say, moreover, that autonomy will henceforth be clothed with peculiarly seductive charms; for the small freeholders about to be created will be told that a Dublin legislature could relieve them of the rental imposed upon them by the Land Purchase act. The priests, on their part, would be well aware that they could obtain from a Dublin legislature what they have never yet been able to secure from the British Parliament, to wit, a great teaching university for Irish Catholics and adequate Government aid for their primary and secondary education. Indeed, it is by no means improbable that a Dublin legislature could be prevailed upon to declare Catholicism the State religion of Ireland. Nor will any reasonable man deny that Catholicism has a better claim to be established in Ireland—being the faith professed by a very large majority of the inhabitants—than has Anglicanism to be established in England. Such an innovation, startling as it may seem, looks less chimerical to-day than the notion that the present Land Purchase act might be passed by a Unionist Government would have looked a few years ago.

Not only have the Home Rulers been made incalculably stronger in Ireland, but their opponents in Great Britain are threatened with disintegration and collapse. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN has split the Unionist party. His proposal to tax food products in the United Kingdom for the purpose of giving a preference to imports from the Colonies has been denounced by three Unionist Chancellors of the Exchequer, Mr. RITCHIE,

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH and Lord GORCHEN. Nothing short of a unanimous repudiation of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S plans by his fellow Ministers and his virtual expulsion from the Cabinet—which nobody expects to witness—can prevent the disorganization of the Unionists at the next general election, which is not likely to be long deferred.

Disorganization is almost certain to mean defeat, although the Liberals, in their present disjointed condition, may not be able to secure in the next House of Commons a working majority over Unionists and Irish Nationalists combined.

It is probable that again, as in 1886 and ever since, they will find themselves incapable of forming a Government without Nationalist support. To obtain that support, they will pay the price, which will be Home Rule.

The concession, therefore, of legislative independence to Ireland seems to us imminent, if not inevitable, so far as the House of Commons is concerned. Nor is there any reason to believe that the House of Lords would resist such a project with its former inflexibility.

The Irish landlords were impossibly entrenched in the upper house, but the Irish landlords are on the verge of elimination. Having converted their estates into money, they will cease to have any personal motive for a desperate opposition to Home Rule, but, on the contrary, will recognize the importance of gaining the good will of the Irish people if they wish to continue to reside in Ireland.

These are our reasons for believing that never in a hundred years has Ireland been so near a repeal of the Act of Union as she is to-day.

## Headquarters at Sing Sing.

SAM PARKS'S subjects are faithful to him. The Households and Bridgemen's Union, of which he was a walking delegate and the sovereign, has passed a resolution of confidence in him and voted to continue indefinitely his pay of \$18 a week.

During his retirement in Sing Sing prison, he will necessarily be shut out from those royal perquisites for factoring \$200 of which from a manufacturer, under a threat of a strike, he has been exiled for a time from his kingdom. His devoted people will not withhold their tribute, and they show their enthusiastic loyalty by recommending that he be Grand Marshal of the Labor Day parade; and that if he is still detained in captivity, "a horse be led for him to mark his place in the line."

## A Great Benefactor of New York.

The death of FREDERICK LAW OLIMSTED, in his eighty-second year, at the Massachusetts town of Waverly, on Friday, recalls the history of the conception and development of the scheme of our Central Park, for with that splendid achievement his name will always be associated, first of all, in the public mind.

In April, 1851, AMBROSE C. KINGSLAND, then Mayor of New York, addressed to the Common Council a message urging the establishment of a park in the "northern section of the island," where "dwelling" will ere long fill up the streets and avenues north of Union Park; and he advised immediate steps toward the purchase of the necessary land because "each year will witness a certain increase in the value of real estate outside of the city proper" which could then be obtained "at a comparatively small expense." Population, said the Mayor, is tending to the northern wards "but a few years since considered as entirely out of the city," and "it seems obvious that the entire tongue of land south of a line drawn across the City Hall Park is destined to be devoted solely to commercial purposes."

In 1856, five years after, the municipal government took possession of the land which is now Central Park, acquired for about five millions of dollars. Out of thirty-three plans for its construction, the one offered by Mr. FREDERICK LAW OLIMSTED and Mr. CALVERT VAUX, in association, was accepted, and under their direction Central Park was laid out.

The President and executive officer of the Central Park Board from 1857 to 1870 was Mr. ANDREW H. GREEN, and the development of a peculiarly unattractive region into a beautiful and magnificent pleasure ground, according to the plans of Messrs. OLIMSTED and VAUX, was largely due to his vigilance and his consummate administrative ability. Happily, Mr. GREEN survives Mr. OLIMSTED, who was two years his junior, and retains his zeal and his ability further to serve public interests; but his administration of Central Park from its foundation to the time when it had been made one of the most artistically beautiful parks in the world will remain a prime contribution by him to New York.

The making of even a fairly slightly park of the land acquired by the city seemed a hopeless undertaking to those who knew the district in 1857. It was a region of "squatters," desolate, mean, infested with swamps, rocky, altogether unattractive. The splendid achievement of Mr. OLIMSTED, with the assistance of Mr. CALVERT VAUX and Mr. WREY MOULD, can only be appreciated properly by people whose recollections go back to that period in the history of New York. A marvellous transformation was brought about by skill and genius in an unpromising region, in the course of a very few years.

The year when the making of Central Park began was the notable year 1857, the year of the terrible financial and commercial panic and of the Great Awakening, or the religious revival which

spread through the Union. The distress among the working people was acute, free soup kitchens were set up in different parts of the town, and the building of the Central Park proved a godsend, for work on it was given to many of the unemployed.

The first long step in the development of New York into a great capital of civilization was taken in the transformation of an unsightly district into one of the world's most beautiful and most extensive urban pleasure grounds, through the artistic genius of FREDERICK LAW OLIMSTED and CALVERT VAUX, under the able administration of ANDREW HASWELL GREEN.

## Dr. Farr's Farewell.

WILLIAM FARR, Ph. D., LL. D., has ceased to be the head of that famous nursery of lawyers, the American Nashville College of Law, and has become the editor of *American Legal Lore*, "a national journal of law devoted to the advancement of legal education in America." The October number of that periodical contains his farewell address and the Tennessee Constitution, whose methods for the advancement of legal education, especially by means of "correspondence courses," have not yet received from American lawyers the applause which Dr. FARR'S high ethical and altruistic purpose may be thought to have merited. "Our motto," his valedictory tells us, "has been that we shall have this world but once, and therefore any good thing we could do or any kindness that we could bestow upon a truly worthy one, let us do it now, let us not defer it, nor neglect it, for we shall not pass this way again."

In accord with this rule of kindness to the truly worthy and of taking advantage of "a good thing," it has been the privilege and pleasure of Dr. FARR in the last five years to matriculate some 8,000 resident students in Tennessee and other States and about 20,000 correspondence students, "a grand total of about 21,000 men and women." More than 5,000 a year. In spite of the fact that "many have been called but few have been chosen," Dr. FARR'S success has stirred the envy of competitors. Dr. FARR'S defence of his learned and philanthropic scheme of doing business must cover his detractors with confusion:

"We wanted students, and consequently made a persistent effort to get students, and by our untiring efforts, day by day, we secured them, not by the half-dozen, as some of our competitors, but by the hundreds and, later, by the thousands. Some of our jealous competitors, becoming weary of our success, commenced circulating the college for charging a small incidental fee when it conferred its annual honors. It is true that, in most cases, when the students have completed their courses, and in cases where the institution has conferred honors upon its friends in the leading professions, it has, as a rule, made a small charge of \$10 to cover the actual cost of lithographing, engraving and testing its diplomas, given in evidence of any of its students or friends having received a degree from the institution. . . . If money had been the object, not the patting sum of \$10, but in many instances hundreds and sometimes thousands of dollars might have been easily obtained for honors sought from this institution, which is held as a testimonial of efficiency and worth and is recognized by every court on earth where diplomas admit to the bar and serve as a passport to the membership of the good profession, the law."

Dr. FARR is rightly surprised at his own moderation. The diploma was dirt-cheap at \$10, especially if it contained his portrait. We are obliged to content ourselves with one drawn by his own hand:

"While occupying the position of President, I have done my duty. I have tried to do it well with this consciousness, I feel that as the years shall come and go that my heart may be filled with the certainty of an almost satisfied ambition. I believe it was HARDENBERG of New Jersey who said, 'Man, in all his wide domain, hath no gift more precious than the power of thought. Let mortal soul! I shall try to keep my thoughts like unto his, who stood and measured the world and the heights and depths thereof, and the everlasting mountains scattered, and the eternal hills did bow.'"

We are ashamed to say that we can't remember HARDENBERG of New Jersey, but he has honor enough in being cited by FARR of Tennessee.

## The Religious Discussion.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—The "Religion" is a machine, a marvelous invention. Said Sir Thomas Lipton in an interview "but the Shamrock is prettier."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—I take a lively interest in and read daily all the letters published on the editorial page of THE SUN. To my mind, no more interesting and instructive matter is elsewhere obtainable. From a literary point of view the letters on religious questions impress me as models of perfection, ably written and sincere; but with our most intelligent and scholarly writers at variance and offering so great a diversity of theories on these questions, how is it possible for the vast unlearned masses to arrive at any definite or satisfying conclusion? For one, I find only confusion worse confounded.

Divested of all dogmas, rituals, medieval customs and practices, what are religion and Christianity? We either do or do not believe in God and a future existence. If we believe in the resurrection and eternity of the soul, etc., what effect, or influence, if any, will demonstration, or the absence of it, have on our conduct? The kingdom of heaven, other conditions being equal, so long as the belief is there? H. J. D. BROOKLYN, Aug. 27.

## St. Elmo's Fire Reported Ashore.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Last night, after a very hot and stifling day, we had a brilliant display of lightning and a thunderstorm, which was followed by a heavy rain. A peculiar light on the top of a large maple tree about fifty feet away. He called me, and together we watched the light about ten minutes.

The tree, having lost some of its branches, is almost straight across the top, and along this line the light played in a dancing, flickering way, measuring as nearly as we could judge, from about two feet at one end of the line to a few inches at the other. They were very bright just after a dash of lightning and grew dimmer until a fresh flash. When the rain came we saw no more light for some time, but after a while it appeared dimly a few times after lightning flashes.

Is not this a very rare occurrence? We hear of St. Elmo's light on ships and sometimes on high mountains, but I had never known of its appearing on the tops of trees. GALLIPOLIS, Ohio, Aug. 28.

## More Nominations.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—At the next election what could beat this ticket? J. M. Jeffries for Sheriff.

And then appoint Sir Tommy Grogan of the Port, thereby giving him a chance to get even. NEW YORK, Aug. 28.

## Unerring Childhood.

From the Academy.

ness to largeness, from the valley to the heights where the air is pure, the sky clear and the vision enlarged. Here is happiness worth the journey; here is pleasure unconfined. The price is worth the cost."

## And Dr. FARR takes the prize.

### The Postponed Yacht Race.

Old BORAS evidently became weary of the continued sneering at "America's Cup weather" and set out on Friday to show what he could do. Those who have been in the habit of visiting the Jersey coast summer resorts were not at all surprised by the arrival of that familiar cold storm which generally closes "the season" with firmness and celerity. It was most unfortunate that the storm could not have been postponed till tomorrow, but the weather department, as all men have noted, reckons not of dates nor of days, nor even of holidays.

The yacht race was very properly postponed, to the great dissatisfaction of curbstone seamen, whose nautical lore is gathered from the bulletin boards. The yachtsmen down in the Horseshoe were berated roundly by these sapient critics, who declared that they were afraid to give their vessels a good trial in a stiff wind and a rough sea.

The curbstone critics were right. The yachtsmen were afraid. Of course it is a stretch of courtesy to describe a northeasterly gale off Sandy Hook as a stiff wind, but no matter. The yachtsmen were afraid that if they went out they might ruin their sails, carry away their masts and possibly batter in the hulls of their craft—for these vessels are merely racing machines, not Newfoundlander sealers.

On such a day as yesterday not even the skipper of a four-masted ship would go to sea if he could help it, and he usually could. If the yachts had gone out, they would have been under close-reefed canvas and probably could not have worked to windward. But people do not have to race yachts in storms, even to escape the derisive comments of those who in such weather do not like to cross the North River in a ferryboat.

Just two years ago the American Bar Association held its annual meeting away out in Denver. It was upon that occasion that the once famous but now unjustly forgotten Mr. LITTLEFIELD of Maine began his career of temporary obloquy by overruling the decisions of the Supreme Court in the insular cases.

If Mr. LITTLEFIELD had happened to be the chairman of a committee of the Bar Association, instead of a Maine member, he might have put his severe censure of the Supreme Court in the form of a committee report and invited the association to take formal action on the same, with a view to setting the ultimate tribunal right in the performance of its highest constitutional function.

That is where Mr. WALTER S. LOGAN of this town had a slight advantage over Mr. LITTLEFIELD of Maine. At the session of the association, Logan happened to be chairman of a committee. He was therefore able to work in his crank speech in semi-official shape as a report, which the association wisely and mercifully returned to him for more specific recommendations next year.

That is all there is in an incident which some of our contemporaries seem to regard as of considerable importance.

## Possibilities of the Catamaran.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—The "Religion" is a machine, a marvelous invention. Said Sir Thomas Lipton in an interview "but the Shamrock is prettier."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—I take a lively interest in and read daily all the letters published on the editorial page of THE SUN. To my mind, no more interesting and instructive matter is elsewhere obtainable. From a literary point of view the letters on religious questions impress me as models of perfection, ably written and sincere; but with our most intelligent and scholarly writers at variance and offering so great a diversity of theories on these questions, how is it possible for the vast unlearned masses to arrive at any definite or satisfying conclusion? For one, I find only confusion worse confounded.

Divested of all dogmas, rituals, medieval customs and practices, what are religion and Christianity? We either do or do not believe in God and a future existence. If we believe in the resurrection and eternity of the soul, etc., what effect, or influence, if any, will demonstration, or the absence of it, have on our conduct? The kingdom of heaven, other conditions being equal, so long as the belief is there? H. J. D. BROOKLYN, Aug. 27.

## Christies of Literature.

Virgil was reciting his *Æneid*. "But, why," asked his friends, "do you sing of Arms and the Man?"

"I don't think," he faltered, "of course, I should have made it *Feet and the Man*."

FOURTH of this such as the football heroes would kill his epic. He was not a poet, but a player. He had climbed the ladder to Juliet's balcony. "Am I justly loved," he murmured, "or not?" "Yes," answered the adoring lady, "there can be any answer but the soft trouble this way."

There was found in text. "And it is because you are outwaded," asked his faithful dependents.

"No," sobbed the great orator, "they haven't wronged me, but I am outwaded by the law."

Macaulay had just finished the work. "Tell us," said his friends, "why do you call it 'The Days of Ancient Rome'?"

"I have answered," "The lies are the historical notes."

Satisfied he hadn't made a slip in his English, they gave unstinted praise.

## No Labor Parties in Heaven.

From the London Daily Chronicle.

Senator Walker told a story during a recent debate in the Upper House of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He said that a Chinese laborer in China was endeavoring to convert one of the natives. "Suppose," he said, "you go to heaven."

"All right," returned the heathen, "but what if you no let Chinaman into Australia when you let him into heaven?" "Ah," said the missionary with fervor, "there's no labor party in heaven."

## Peculiarities of Fish.

From the Boston Herald.

## QUESTION OF NATURALIZATION. Law Needed.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The existing naturalization law is not generally understood, because it is generally read. Its terms are very clear. It provides that persons of foreign birth may become citizens by the order and decree of any court of record, Federal or State, (which satisfy the Judge by the testimony of at least two witnesses, first, that they are of good moral character; second, that they are attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States; and, third, that they are well disposed to the peace and good order of the Government.)

It is not sufficient that they apply for naturalization and produce two witnesses to swear that they possess these qualifications. The law gives the Judge no authority to admit them to citizenship, even if twenty witnesses so testify, unless he is "satisfied" of the truth of their testimony. "Satisfied" is the word of the statute.

The great body of applicants and their witnesses are manifestly totally ignorant of the meaning of the questions put to them by the court, and simply answer, "Yes" to them all, as they are unable to read or write. The agents of the political committees of both parties who hunt them up and bring them in to have them made voters. The slightest cross-examination of the witnesses would compel the Judge to deny application.

The witness when asked: "Is the applicant attached to the principles of the Constitution?" always answers, "Yes, sir." But what could he say, in almost any case, of every twenty, if asked: "How do you know this? What have you ever heard him say about the Constitution? Which of its principles did you ever hear him mention? What do you yourself know about the principles of the Constitution?" The witnesses would confess their ignorance and refute his own testimony as given in his answer to the first question.

I once heard an applicant who had been asked by Justice Peckham to come to court at San Francisco, if he was in favor of a republican form of government. Reply: "No sir, I am a Democrat." The Judge, who was himself a Democrat, did not admit him to citizenship.

No change in the naturalization law is necessary to make it the duty of Judges to get at the truth in each case. It has so long been the custom to admit the applicant upon the mere "swear" of ignorant witnesses, that to inaugurate the system of their cross-examination would be an innovation which would displease those who are interested in making voters without limit, but the remedy is so simple and does not fully within the power of the courts, that there ought to be concerted action among Judges to reform the present loose practice, which is nothing less than vicious legislation from the bench.

GEORGE C. GORHAM.

## Advantages of Admitting the Foreign-Born to Citizenship.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Our suffrage is largely a representation of practical interests. As a public we say that the worker is to be represented as well as the employer, the tenant as well as the landlord. The immigrant is here as a worker. If he were not needed for the development of our resources, he would certainly be excluded. The Six showed recently that nearly all immigrants are employed in our Northeastern States, leaving other regions without the labor and industry they need. It is a greater crime against the nation than any foreign speech or foreign customs. While the immigrant works, as he always does, he is performing his part for the welfare of the nation, and he is entitled to the vote that represents the interests of the worker. This is American doctrine, which no true American can attack.

I suggested the foreigners should be content to see their children voting. Don't our correspondents know that the children of immigrants are generally well educated, morally, physically, and in practical life? Don't they know that we have more to fear from the children of immigrants brought up among the temptations of cities than from the ignorant and uneducated parents of immigrants? While the immigrant works, as he always does, he is performing his part for the welfare of the nation, and he is entitled to the vote that represents the interests of the worker. This is American doctrine, which no true American can attack.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The "Religion" is a machine, a marvelous invention. Said Sir Thomas Lipton in an interview "but the Shamrock is prettier."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—I take a lively interest in and read daily all the letters published on the editorial page of THE SUN. To my mind, no more interesting and instructive matter is elsewhere obtainable. From a literary point of view the letters on religious questions impress me as models of perfection, ably written and sincere; but with our most intelligent and scholarly writers at variance and offering so great a diversity of theories on these questions, how is it possible for the vast unlearned masses to arrive at any definite or satisfying conclusion? For one, I find only confusion worse confounded.

Divested of all dogmas, rituals, medieval customs and practices, what are religion and Christianity? We either do or do not believe in God and a future existence. If we believe in the resurrection and eternity of the soul, etc., what effect, or influence, if any, will demonstration, or the absence of it, have on our conduct? The kingdom of heaven, other conditions being equal, so long as the belief is there? H. J. D. BROOKLYN, Aug. 27.

## Christies of Literature.

Virgil was reciting his *Æneid*. "But, why," asked his friends, "do you sing of Arms and the Man?"

"I don't think," he faltered, "of course, I should have made it *Feet and the Man*."

FOURTH of this such as the football heroes would kill his epic. He was not a poet, but a player. He had climbed the ladder to Juliet's balcony. "Am I justly loved," he murmured, "or not?"

"Yes," answered the adoring lady, "there can be any answer but